arXiv:1407.2336v3 [math.CO] 12 Aug 2015

FAVARON'S THEOREM, k-DEPENDENCE, AND TUZA'S CONJECTURE

GREGORY J. PULEO

ABSTRACT. A vertex set D in a graph G is *k-dependent* if $G[D]$ has maximum degree at most $k-1$, and *k-dominating* if every vertex outside D has at least k neighbors in D. Favaron proved that if D is a k-dependent set maximizing the quantity $k|D| - |E(G[D])|$, then D is k-dominating. We extend this result, showing that such sets satisfy a stronger structural property, and we find a surprising connection between Favaron's theorem and a conjecture of Tuza regarding packing and covering of triangles.

1. INTRODUCTION

A vertex set D in a graph G is *independent* if the induced subgraph $G[D]$ has no edges. A vertex set is *dominating* if every vertex of G either lies in the set, or has a neighbor in the set. Ore [19] observed that any maximal independent set is also a dominating set: by the maximality of the independent set, every vertex outside the set must have a neighbor in the set. Thus, $\gamma(G) \leq \alpha(G)$ for any graph G, where $\gamma(G)$ is the size of a smallest dominating set and $\alpha(G)$ is the size of a largest independent set. Fink and Jacobson [6, 7] generalized the notions of independence and domination as follows.

Definition 1.1. For positive integers k, a vertex set $D \subset V(G)$ is *k-dependent* if the induced subgraph $G[D]$ has maximum degree at most $k-1$. A vertex set D is *k-dominating* if $|N(v) \cap D| \geq k$ for all $v \in V(G) - D$.

Fink and Jacobson posed the following question: letting $\gamma_k(G)$ denote the size of a smallest k-dominating set in G and letting $\alpha_k(G)$ denote the size of a largest k-dependent set in G, is it true that $\gamma_k(G) \leq \alpha_k(G)$ for all k? Setting $k = 1$ yields the original inequality $\gamma(G) \leq \alpha(G)$. However, for $k > 1$ it is no longer true that every maximal k-dependent set is k-dominating. Favaron [5] answered the question of Fink and Jacobson, using a different notion of "optimality" for k-dependent sets.

Theorem 1.2 (Favaron [5])**.** *If D is a k-dependent set maximizing the quantity $k|D| - |E(G[D])|$ (over all k-dependent sets), then D is a k-dominating set.*

Since any set of at most k vertices is a k-dependent set, it follows that every graph has a set of vertices which is both k-dependent and k-dominating, which yields $\gamma_k(G) \leq \alpha_k(G)$. Theorem 1.2 motivates the following definition.

Definition 1.3. For any set D, define $\phi_k(D) = k|D| - |E(G[D])|$. A *$k$-optimal set* is a k-dependent set maximizing ϕ_k over all k-dependent sets.

Date: August 13, 2015.

The notation $\phi_k(D)$ is borrowed from the survey paper [3]. Notice that the maximum value of ϕ_k over all k-dependent sets is equal to the maximum value of ϕ_k over all vertex sets, since if D is an arbitrary vertex set and $v \in D$ has degree exceeding $k-1$ in $G[D]$, then $\phi_k(D-v) \geq \phi_k(D)$. We extend Theorem 1.2 by proving that k-optimal sets satisfy a property stronger than k-domination.

Theorem 1.4. *Let D be a k-optimal set in a graph G, let $X = V(G) - D$, and let H be the maximal bipartite subgraph of G with partite sets D and X. If J is any orientation of $G[X]$, then H has a k-edge-chromatic subgraph M such that $d_M(v)+d_J^+(v) \geq k$ for all $v \in X$, where $d_J^+(v)$ is the outdegree of v in the orientation J.*

In particular, since we can take any vertex $v \in V(G) - D$ to have outdegree 0 in J, Theorem 1.4 implies that any k-optimal set is k-dominating. In fact, we have the following stronger corollary, obtained by taking the vertices of an independent set to have outdegree 0 in J.

Corollary 1.5. *Let D be a k-optimal set in a graph G. For any independent set S disjoint from D, there are k disjoint matchings of S into D, each saturating S.*

We now turn to a conjecture of Tuza concerning packing and covering of triangles. Given a graph G, let $\tau(G)$ denote the minimum size of an edge set Y such that $G - Y$ is triangle-free, and let $\nu(G)$ denote the maximum size of a set of pairwise edge-disjoint triangles in G. It is easy to show that $\nu(G) \leq \tau(G) \leq 3\nu(G)$: if $\mathcal{S}$ is a largest set of pairwise edge-disjoint triangles, then to make G triangle-free we must delete at least one edge from each triangle of $\mathcal{S}$, and on the other hand deleting all edges contained in triangles of $\mathcal{S}$ will always make G triangle-free. Tuza conjectured a stronger upper bound.

Conjecture 1.6 (Tuza's Conjecture [23, 24])**.** *$\tau(G) \leq 2\nu(G)$ for all graphs G.*

Tuza's Conjecture is sharp, if true; as observed by Tuza [24], equality in the upper bound is acheieved by any graph whose blocks are all isomorphic to K_4, among other examples. The best general upper bound on $\tau(G)$ in terms of $\nu(G)$ is due to Haxell [12], who showed that $\tau(G) \leq 2.87\nu(G)$ for all graphs G. Tuza's Conjecture has been studied by many authors, who proved the conjecture for special classes of graph [14, 16, 20, 21, 22] or studied various fractional relaxations of the conjecture [2, 13, 15, 16].

A major theme of the author's previous work on Tuza's Conjecture [20] is to reduce questions about triangle packings to questions about matchings, since matchings are very well understood. In this paper, we therefore study the conjecture on graphs of the form $I_k \vee H$, where I_k is an independent set of size k, H is a triangle-free graph, and the *join* $G_1 \vee G_2$ of two graphs G_1 and G_2 is obtained from the disjoint union of G_1 and G_2 by adding all possible edges between $V(G_1)$ and $V(G_2)$. Each triangle of $I_k \vee H$ consists of an edge in H together with a vertex of I; thus, triangle packings in $I_k \vee H$ correspond to partial k-edge-colorings of H. The connection between Tuza's Conjecture and Favaron's Theorem is given by the following result.

Theorem 1.7. *For a graph G and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $\phi_k(G)$ denote the maximum value of $\phi_k(D)$ over all k-dependent sets $D \subset V(G)$, and let $\alpha'_k(G)$ denote the largest*

number of edges in a k-edge-colorable subgraph of G. If H is triangle-free, then

$$\nu(I_k \vee H) = \alpha'_k(H), \text{ and}$$
$$\tau(I_k \vee H) = k\,|V(H)| - \phi_k(H).$$

Thus, this special case of Tuza's Conjecture can be interpreted as requesting a relationship between the ϕ_k-value of a k-optimal set and the size of a largest k-edge-colorable subgraph of a graph. We formalize this special case below.

Conjecture 1.8. *If $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and H is a triangle-free graph, then $\tau(I_k \vee H) \leq 2\nu(I_k \vee H)$. Equivalently, $\alpha'_k(H) \geq k\,|V(H)| - \phi_k(H)$.*

A similar idea appears in a paper of Chapuy, DeVos, McDonald, Mohar, and Schiede [2]. Studying a fractional version of Tuza's conjecture, they consider a triangle-free Ramsey graph H with low independence number (hence matching number close to $|V(H)|/2$) and use $I_1 \vee H$ as a sharpness example for an upper bound on $\tau(G)$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we build some intuition by exploring the $k = 1$ case of Theorem 1.4. Based on a result that holds in the $k = 1$ case, we pose the following conjecture, which is natural in its own right and which implies Conjecture 1.8:

Conjecture 1.9. *If D is a k-optimal set in a graph G, then G has a k-edge-chromatic subgraph in which every vertex of $V(G) - D$ has degree k.*

In Section 3 we prove a generalization of a theorem of Lebensold concerning disjoint matchings in bipartite graphs. In Section 4 we apply the results of Section 3 to prove Theorem 1.4. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.7 and and show that Conjecture 1.9 implies Conjecture 1.8. In Section 6 we introduce the notion of *saturability*, which is a variant of list edge coloring. We formulate a conjecture about graph decompositions and show that this conjecture implies Conjecture 1.9. The proof uses Galvin's kernel method [10]. Finally, we apply Theorem 1.4 to prove that Conjecture 1.9 holds for chordal graphs.

2. The $k = 1$ Case of Theorem 1.4

When $k = 1$, things are simpler: a 1-dependent set is just an independent set, so a 1-optimal set is just a maximum-size independent set. The statement of Theorem 1.4 can also be simplified: when $k = 1$, the only vertices of $V(G) - D$ for which the theorem says anything are those of outdegree 0, which form an independent set. Thus, the $k = 1$ case of Theorem 1.4 is equivalent to the following proposition, which we prove using Hall's Theorem [11]:

Proposition 2.1. *Let D be a maximum-size independent set in a graph G. If T is an independent set disjoint from D, then G has a matching of T into D that saturates T.*

Proof. Assume that no such matching exists; we will obtain an independent set D' with $|D'| > |D|$. If no such matching exists, then by Hall's Theorem, there is a set $S \subset T$ such that $|N(S) \cap D| < |S|$. Let $D' = (D - N(S)) \cup S$. Since S and D are independent and since we have deleted $N(S)$, the set D' is also independent. Since $|N(S) \cap D| < |S|$, we have $|D'| > |D|$, as desired. □

In fact, Proposition 2.1 is one half of Berge's "Maximum Stable Set Lemma" [1], which states that an independent set D is maximum if and only if every independent set T disjoint from D matches into D.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 uses a similar strategy to the proof of Proposition 2.1: assuming that the desired k-edge-chromatic subgraph does not exist, we obtain a set of vertices for which a similar Hall-type condition fails, and we use this set of vertices to construct a "better" k-dependent set.

Proposition 2.1 implies the $k = 1$ case of Conjecture 1.9, but we have not been able to generalize this proof to higher k.

Corollary 2.2. *If D is a maximum-size independent set in a graph G, then G has a matching that saturates every vertex of $V(G) - D$.*

Proof. Let M_1 be a maximal matching in $V(G) - D$, and let S be the set of vertices in $V(G) - D$ not saturated by M_1. Since M_1 is a maximal matching, S is an independent set. By Proposition 2.1, there is a matching M_2 of S into D that saturates S. Thus, $M_1 \cup M_2$ is a matching that saturates $V(G) - D$. □

Since Theorem 1.4 generalizes Proposition 2.1, one would hope that it could play an analogous role in a proof of Conjecture 1.9, but it appears difficult to find a suitable orientation to use. This difficulty is explored further in Section 5.

3. Extending Lebensold's Theorem

Lebensold [17] proved the following generalization of Hall's Theorem. As Brualdi observed in his review of [17], the theorem is equivalent to a theorem of Fulkerson [8] concerning disjoint permutations in $0,1$-matrices. An alternative proof of the theorem, using matroid theory, is due to Murty [18].

Theorem 3.1 (Lebensold [17])**.** *An X, D-bigraph has k disjoint matchings from X into D, each saturating X, if and only if*

$$\sum_{v \in D} \min\{k, |N(v) \cap S|\} \geq k\,|S|$$

for every subset $S \subset X$.

We extend the theorem to find necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a k-edge-chromatic subgraph in which the vertices of X are allowed to have different degrees.

Lemma 3.2. *Let H be an X, D-bigraph, and write $X = \{v_1, \ldots, v_t\}$. Let k be a positive integer and let $d_1, \ldots, d_t$ be nonnegative integers with all $d_i \leq k$. The following are equivalent:*

(1) H has a k-edge-chromatic subgraph M such that $d_M(v_i) \geq d_i$ for all i;
(2) For every subset $S \subset X$,

$$\sum_{v \in D} \min\{k, |N(v) \cap S|\} \geq \sum_{v_i \in S} d_i.$$

Theorem 3.1 is the special case of Lemma 3.2 obtained when all $d_i = k$. We prove Lemma 3.2 using Theorem 3.1, so Theorem 3.1 is self-strengthening in this sense.

Proof. For each i, let D_i be a set of size $k - d_i$, with all sets D_i disjoint from each other and disjoint from $V(H)$, and let $D' = D \cup D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_t$. Let H' be the X, D'-bigraph obtained from H by making the vertices in D_i adjacent only to v_i. Consider the following two statements:

(1′) H' has k edge-disjoint matchings, each saturating X;
(2′) For every subset $S \subset X$,

$$\sum_{v \in D'} \min\{k, |N(v) \cap S|\} \geq k\,|S|\,.$$

By Theorem 3.1, (1′) is equivalent to (2′). We prove that (1) is equivalent to (1′) and (2) is equivalent to (2′).

If $M_1, \ldots, M_k$ are edge-disjoint matchings in H' each saturating X, then their restriction to H yields a k-edge-chromatic subgraph M of H with each $d_M(v_i) \geq d_i$. Conversely, any such subgraph of H can be extended to k edge-disjoint matchings in H'. Thus, (1) is equivalent to (1′).

Elements of D_i each contribute 1 to the sum in (2′) when $v_i \in S$, and contribute 0 otherwise. This yields

$$\sum_{v \in D'} \min\{k, |N(v) \cap S|\} = \sum_{v_i \in S} (k - d_i) + \sum_{v \in D} \min\{k, |N(v) \cap S|\},$$

so (2) is equivalent to (2′). □

4. Proof of Theorem 1.4

The following observation was mentioned in the introduction; we repeat it here because of its central role in this section.

Observation 4.1. *If G is a graph and $T \subset V(G)$, then for any k, there is a k-dependent subset $D \subset T$ such that $\phi_k(D) \geq \phi_k(T)$.*

As a consequence of Observation 4.1, in order to prove that some vertex set D is not k-optimal, it suffices to find *any* vertex set D' with $\phi_k(D') > \phi_k(D)$, without worrying about whether D' is k-dependent. When k is a nonnegative integer, we write $[k]$ for the set $\{1, \ldots, k\}$.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let D be a k-dependent set, let $X = V(G) - D$, and let J be an orientation of $G[X]$. Assuming that there is no k-edge-chromatic subgraph with the desired properties, we construct a set D' with $\phi_k(D') > \phi_k(D)$.

Since there is no k-edge-chromatic subgraph with the desired properties, applying Lemma 3.2 with $d_i = \max\{0, k - d_J^+(v)\}$ shows that there is a set $S \subset X$ such that

$$\sum_{v \in D} \min\{k, |N(v) \cap S|\} < \sum_{v_i \in S} \max\{0, k - d_J^+(v)\}.$$

We may assume that $d_J^+(v) \leq k$ for all $v \in S$, since vertices with $d_J^+(v) > k$ may be removed from S without causing the above inequality to fail. This gives the simpler inequality

$$\sum_{v \in D} \min\{k, |N(v) \cap S|\} < k\,|S| - \sum_{v_i \in S} d_J^+(v). \tag{1}$$

Define sets B and A by

$$B = \{v \in D\colon\ |N(v) \cap S| \leq k-1\},$$
$$A = D - B,$$

Let $D' = B \cup S$. We claim that $\phi_k(D') > \phi_k(D)$. First observe that

$$\sum_{v\in D} \min\{k, |N(v)\cap S|\} = k\,|A| + \sum_{v\in B} |N(v)\cap S| = k\,|A| + |[S,B]|\,,$$

where $[S,B]$ is the set of all edges with one endpoint in S and the other endpoint in B. Thus, from (1),

$$\begin{aligned} k\,|A| + |[S,B]| &< k\,|S| - \sum_{v_i\in S} d_J^+(v) \\ &\leq k\,|S| - |E(G[S])|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\phi_k(D') \geq \phi_k(D) - k\,|A| + k\,|S| - |[S,B]| - |E(G[S])|\,.$$

Combining this with Inequality 2 yields $\phi_k(D') > \phi_k(D)$, as desired. Thus, when D is k-optimal, a k-edge-chromatic subgraph with the desired properties exists. □

5. Tuza's Conjecture and Conjecture 1.9

We first prove Theorem 1.7, which furnishes a connection between Tuza's Conjecture and k-optimal sets.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $G = I_k \vee H$. We first show that $\nu(G) = \alpha'_k(H)$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a maximum set of edge disjoint triangles in G. For each $v \in I_k$, let $\mathcal{S}_v = \{T \in \mathcal{S}\colon\ v \in T\}$. Since each triangle in G consists of exactly one vertex of I_k together with an edge in H, we can write $\mathcal{S}$ as the disjoint union $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{v\in I_k} \mathcal{S}_v$. Since the triangles in $\mathcal{S}_v$ are edge-disjoint, no two triangles in $\mathcal{S}_v$ can share a common vertex $w \in V(H)$: if this were the case, they would intersect in the edge vw. Hence the edges of $\mathcal{S}_v$ that lie in H form a matching M_v in H. Since the triangles in $\mathcal{S}$ are edge-disjoint, it follows that the matchings M_v are pairwise disjoint, so $\bigcup_{v\in I_k} M_v$ is a k-edge-colorable subgraph of H having size $\nu(G)$. Therefore, $\nu(G) \leq \alpha'_k(H)$.

On the other hand, if H_0 is a maximum k-edge-colorable subgraph of H, then we can write $E(H_0) = M_1 \cup \cdots \cup M_k$, where each M_i is a matching. Let $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ be the vertices of I_k, and for $i \in [k]$, let $\mathcal{S}_i = \{v_i wz\colon\ wz \in M_i\}$. Now $\bigcup_{i\in[k]} \mathcal{S}_i$ is a family of $\alpha'_k(H)$ pairwise edge-disjoint triangles in G, so $\nu(G) \geq \alpha'_k(H)$.

Next we show that $\tau(G) = k\,|V(H)| - \phi_k(H)$. Let D be a k-optimal subset of $V(H)$, and define an edge set X by

$$X = E(D) \cup \{vw\colon\ v \in I_k \text{ and } w \in V(H) - D\}.$$

Clearly, $|X| = |E(G[D])| + k(|V(H)| - |D|)$, which rearranges to $|X| = k\,|V(H)| - \phi_k(H)$, since D is k-optimal. We claim that $G - X$ is triangle-free. Let T be any triangle in G; we may write $T = uvw$, where $uw \in E(H)$ and $v \in I_k$. If $u \notin D$, then $vu \in X$, and likewise for w. On the other hand, if $u, w \in D$, then $uw \in X$. Hence $G - X$ is triangle-free, so $\tau(G) \leq k\,|V(H)| - \phi_k(H)$.

Conversely, let X be a minimum edge set such that $G - X$ is triangle-free. For each $v \in I_k$, let $C_v = \{w \in V(H)\colon vw \notin X\}$. We transform X so that all the sets C_v are equal: pick $v^* \in I_k$ to minimize $|C_{v^*}|$, and define X_1 by

$$X_1 = (X \cap E(H)) \cup \{vw\colon w \in C_{v^*}\}.$$

Now $G - X_1$ is triangle-free: if vwz is a triangle in $G - X_1$, then v^*wz is a triangle in $G - X$, contradicting the assumption that $G - X$ is triangle-free. Furthermore, by the minimality of $|C_{v^*}|$, we have $|X_1| \le |X|$.

Therefore, $|X_1| = |X| = \tau(G)$. Let $D = V(H) - C_{v^*}$. Since $G - X_1$ is triangle-free, we have $E(G[D]) \subset X_1$, and so

$$|X_1| \ge |E(G[D])| + k\,|V(H) - D| = k\,|V(H)| - \phi_k(D).$$

While D need not be k-dependent, the maximum value of ϕ_k over subsets of H is achieved at some k-dependent vertex set, so $\phi_k(D) \le \phi_k(H)$. Hence,

$$\tau(G) = |X_1| \ge k\,|V(H)| - \phi_k(H). \qquad \square$$

The following lemma shows that Conjecture 1.9 implies Conjecture 1.8.

Lemma 5.1. *Let D be a k-optimal set in a graph G. If G has a k-edge-chromatic subgraph in which every vertex of $V(G) - D$ has degree k, then*

$$k\,|V(G)| - \phi_k(G) \le 2\alpha'_k(G).$$

In particular, if G is triangle-free, then $\tau(I_k \vee G) \le 2\nu(I_k \vee G)$.

Proof. Since $\Delta(G[D]) \le k - 1$, Vizing's Theorem [25] implies that $G[D]$ is k-edge-colorable. Let $N_1, \dots, N_k$ be the k edge-disjoint matchings in a k-edge-coloring of $G[D]$, so that $N_1 \cup \cdots \cup N_k = E(G[D])$, and let $M'_1, \dots, M'_k$ be k pairwise edge-disjoint matchings each saturating $V(G) - D$, as guaranteed by the hypothesis. For each i, let M'_i be the matching defined by

$$M_i = M'_i \cup \{e \in N_i\colon e \cap f = \emptyset \text{ for all } f \in M'_i\}.$$

Let $T = M_1 \cup \cdots \cup M_k$. Clearly T is k-edge-chromatic, so $\alpha'_k(G) \ge |T|$.

A *cross-edge* is an edge of T with exactly one endpoint in D. If there are q cross-edges, then the degree-sum formula yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} |M'_i| = \frac{k}{2}\,|V(G) - D| + \frac{q}{2}.$$

Furthermore, if there are r edges of $G[D]$ which fail to appear in T, then each of these edges is "witnessed" by a different cross-edge, so $r \le q$. Clearly $r \le |E(G[D])|$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{k} |M_i| &= \frac{k}{2}\,|V(G) - D| + \frac{q}{2} + |E(G[D])| - r \\ &\ge \frac{k}{2}\,|V(G) - D| + |E(G[D])| - \frac{r}{2} \\ &\ge \frac{k}{2}\,|V(G) - D| + \frac{1}{2}\,|E(G[D])|\,.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$2\alpha'_k(G) \ge 2\,|T| \ge k\,|V(G) - D| + |E(G[D])| = k\,|V(G)| - \phi_k(G). \qquad \square$$

Corollary 5.2. *Conjecture 1.9 implies Conjecture 1.8.*

Remark 5.3. The proof technique of Lemma 5.1 *almost* yields an inductive proof of Conjecture 1.9, in the following sense.

Let D be a k-optimal set of a graph G, let $X = V(G) - D$, and let $G' = G[X]$. Suppose that Conjecture 1.9 holds for G', let D' be a k-optimal set in $G[X]$, and let $M'_1, \dots, M'_k$ be k disjoint matchings in G', each saturating $X - D'$.

Let $N_1, \dots, N_k$ be the matchings of a k-edge-coloring of $G[D]$, and use $N_1, \dots, N_k$ and $M'_1, \dots, M'_k$ to form a k-edge-chromatic subgraph T' in G' by the same method used in the proof of Lemma 5.1. Now for each edge uv of $G[D']$ that fails to lie in T', we have $uv \in N_i$ for some i, and without loss of generality, the endpoint u is covered by M'_i. Orient uv from u to v. (If both endpoints are covered by M'_i, we may orient uv either way.) Let J be the resulting orientation of $G[D']$.

Observe that each vertex $v \in D'$ is incident to $d^+_J(v)$ edges of the k-edge-chromatic graph T'. Since D is k-optimal in G, it is k-optimal in $G[D \cup D']$. Now by Theorem 1.4, there is another k-edge-chromatic graph M with $E(M) \subset [D, D']$ such that $d_M(v) + d^+_J(v) \geq k$ for each $v \in D'$. Thus $M \cup T'$ is a subgraph of G where all vertices outside D have degree at least k; indeed, $M \cup T'$ can be taken so that the vertices outside D have degree exactly k and the vertices of D' have degree at most k. The problem is that $M \cup T'$ need not be k-edge-chromatic, even though M and T' are k-edge-chromatic. In other words, we cannot guarantee that the "received coloring" of M agrees with the received coloring of T'.

6. A Graph Decomposition Conjecture

In this section, we introduce a conjecture concerning graph decomposition which implies Conjecture 1.9 (and therefore Conjecture 1.8).

Definition 6.1. A *sequential decomposition* of a digraph J is a sequence $H_1, H_2, \dots$ of spanning subdigraphs of J such that each arc of J belongs to exactly one H_i.

The only difference between a sequential decomposition and a decomposition in the usual sense is that a sequential decomposition has an explicit order on the subdigraphs, whereas a classical decomposition is an unordered collection of subdigraphs whose edges partition $E(J)$.

Conjecture 6.2. *For every graph G, there is an orientation J having no directed odd cycle and admitting a sequential decomposition $H_1, H_2, \dots$ such that:*

- *Each component of H_i is a directed path or directed even cycle, and*
- *For each $v \in V(J)$ and each i, we have $d^+_{H_i}(v) \geq d^+_{H_{i+1}}(v)$.*

We call a sequential decomposition of the form requested by Conjecture 6.2 a *good decomposition* of J. In the rest of this section, we prove that Conjecture 6.2 implies Conjecture 1.9, and we prove Conjecture 6.2 for chordal graphs, which implies the following special case of Conjecture 1.9.

Theorem 6.3. *If D is a k-optimal set in a chordal graph G, then G has a k-edge-chromatic subgraph in which every vertex of $V(G) - D$ has degree k.*

The proof requires some new definitions. Our main definition is a variant on list coloring. While the concept of a list assignment is well-studied in other contexts, the concept of an ℓ-saturating partial edge coloring for a list assignment is, to our knowledge, new. (Typically, list assignments are used in vertex coloring problems, and represent the colors available at a vertex.)

Definition 6.4. A *list assignment* on a graph G is a function ℓ that assigns to each vertex v a set of colors $\ell(v)$. A (proper) partial edge coloring is *ℓ-saturating* if for every vertex v and every color $c \in \ell(v)$, some edge incident to v receives the color c. A graph G is *ℓ-saturable* if it has an ℓ-saturating partial edge coloring. When f is a function from $V(G)$ into the nonnegative integers, we say that G is *f-saturable* if G is ℓ-saturable whenever $|\ell(v)| \leq f(v)$ for all v.

The connection between Conjecture 1.9 and Definition 6.4 is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *Let D be a k-optimal set in a graph G, and let $X = V(G) - D$. If $G[X]$ has some orientation J such that $G[X]$ is d_J^+-saturable, then G has a k-edge-chromatic subgraph in which all vertices of X have degree k.*

Proof. Let J be any such orientation of X, and let M' be the k-edge-chromatic subgraph given by Theorem 1.4. Write $M' = M'_1 \cup \cdots \cup M'_k$, where each M_i is a matching, and for each $v \in X$, let $\ell(v)$ be the set of all indices $i \in [k]$ such that v is not saturated by M'_i. The degree condition on M' yields $|\ell(v)| = \min\{d_J^+(v), k\}$.

Since $G[X]$ is d_J^+-saturable, there is a partial edge coloring ψ of $G[X]$ that is ℓ-saturating. For $i \in [k]$, let M_i^* be the set of edges that receive color i in ψ. Now we combine the matchings $M_1, \ldots, M_k$ with the matchings $M_1^*, \ldots, M_k^*$. For each $i \in [k]$, let M_i be the set defined by

$$M_i = M_i^* \cup \{e \in M'_i \colon\ e \cap e^* = \emptyset \text{ for all } e^* \in M_i^*\}.$$

By construction, each edge set M_i is a matching. Furthermore, every vertex of v is incident to an edge in each M_i, since if v is not incident to any edge of M'_i, then $i \in L(v)$, so that v is incident to an edge in M_i^*. Thus, the k-edge-chromatic subgraph $M_1 \cup \cdots \cup M_k$ has the desired properties. □

Lemma 6.6. *Let J be an orientation of a graph G. If J admits a good decomposition, then G is d_J^+-saturable.*

The proof of Lemma 6.6 uses Galvin's kernel method; we reproduce the relevant definitions and lemmas here. The proof uses Galvin's kernel method [10], and we reproduce the relevant definitions and lemmas here.

Definition 6.7. A *kernel* of a digraph D is an independent set S such that for every $v \in D - S$, there is some $w \in S$ with $vw \in E(D)$. A digraph is *kernel-perfect* if every induced subgraph has a kernel.

Definition 6.8. If ℓ is a list assignment on G, a *proper ℓ-coloring* of G is a proper coloring ϕ of G such that $\psi(v) \in \ell(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$. If f is a function from $V(G)$ into the nonnegative integers, we say that G is *f-choosable* if: for every list assignment ℓ with $|\ell(v)| \geq f(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$, there is a proper ℓ-coloring of G.

List colorings were first studied by Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor [4] and by Vizing [26].

Lemma 6.9 (Bondy–Boppana–Siegel, see [10])**.** *If D is a kernel-perfect orientation of a graph G and $f(v) = 1 + d_D^+(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$, then G is f-choosable.*

Lemma 6.10 (Galvin [10])**.** *Let H be a line graph of an (X, Y)-bigraph U, and let ϕ be an integer-valued proper edge coloring of U. Define an orientation of H as follows: for $e_1e_2 \in E(H)$ with $\phi(e_1) < \phi(e_2)$, orient the edge e_1e_2 from e_1 to*

e_2 if their common endpoint lies in X, and orient the edge from e_2 to e_1 if their common endpoint lies in Y. The resulting orientation is kernel-perfect.

Proof of Lemma 6.6. Define an auxiliary bipartite graph U as follows. Let X and Y be disjoint copies of $V(G)$, and for each $v \in V(G)$, let v_x and v_y denote the copies of v in X and Y respectively. Define

$$V(U) = X \cup Y,$$
$$E(U) = \{u_x v_y \colon (u, v) \in E(J)\}.$$

Define an edge-coloring ϕ of U as follows: for every arc $(u, v) \in J$, let $\phi(u_x v_y)$ be the unique index i such that $(u, v) \in E(H_i)$. Observe that ϕ is a proper edge-coloring of U, since for each i, every vertex has maximum indegree and maximum outdegree at most 1 in H_i. Furthermore, for every $u_x \in X$, the colors on edges incident to u_x are precisely the colors $\{1, \dots, d(u_x)\}$, since if u_x lacks an incident edge of color i, then $d^+_{H_i}(u) = 0$, which implies $d^+_{H_j}(u) = 0$ for all $j > i$, so that u_x has no incident edge of color j for any $j > i$.

Let Z be the kernel-perfect orientation of $L(U)$ obtained from Lemma 6.10. We claim that every edge $u_x v_y \in E(U)$ has degree at most $d_U(u_x) - 1$ in Z. To see this, let e be an out-neighbor of $u_x v_y$ in Z, and let w be the common endpoint of e and $u_x v_y$. If $w = u_x$, then $\phi(u_x v_y) < \phi(e) \leq d_U(u_x)$, while if $w = v_y$, then $1 \leq \phi(e) < \phi(u_x v_y)$. As ϕ is a proper edge-coloring, this implies that there are at most $d_U(u_x) - 1$ out-neighbors of $u_x v_y$.

By Lemma 6.9, it follows that $L(U)$ is f-choosable, where $f(u_x v_y) = d^+_J(u_x)$ for all $u_x v_y \in E(U)$. Now we show that G is d^+_J-saturable. Let ℓ be any list assignment on G with $|\ell(v)| \leq d^+_J(v)$ for all v. By adding extra colors if necessary, we may assume that $|\ell(v)| = d^+_J(v)$ for all v. Define a list assignment ℓ' on $L(U)$ as follows: for each edge $u_x v_y \in E(U)$, let $\ell'(u_x v_y) = \ell(u_x)$. Since $L(U)$ is f-choosable, there is a proper ℓ'-coloring ψ of $L(U)$.

Observe that for each vertex $u \in V(G)$, we have $d_Z(u_x) = d^+_J(u)$, and that all edges incident to u_x in Z have the list $\ell(u)$ with size $d^+_J(u)$. Thus, for each color $c \in \ell(u)$, the vertex u_x is incident to exactly one edge e with $\psi(e) = c$.

Now for any color c used in ψ, let U_c be the subgraph of Z consisting of the edges of color c, and let J_c be the spanning subdigraph of J with arc set $\{(u, v) \colon u_x v_y \in U_c$. Since ψ is a proper edge-coloring of Z, we see that U_c is a matching, which implies that J_c has maximum indegree and maximum outdegree at most 1. Since J has no odd cycles, every component of J_c is a directed path (possibly a 1-vertex path) or a directed even cycle. Either way, there is a matching M_c in the underlying graph of J_c that covers every vertex with positive outdegree in J_c.

Now we obtain a partial edge-coloring ξ of G by coloring the edges in M_c with color c, for each color c used in ψ. Since each M_c is a matching, the partial edge-coloring is clearly proper. Furthermore, if $c \in \ell(u)$ for $u \in V(G)$, then u_x is incident to some edge e with $\psi(e) = c$, so u has positive outdegree in J_c, and therefore is covered by M_c. It follows that ξ is ℓ-saturating. As ℓ was arbitrary, G is d^+_J-saturable. □

We prove Theorem 6.3 via the following lemma. A *simplicial elimination order* is a vertex ordering $<$ such that when the vertices of G are written $v_1, \dots, v_n$ in order according to $<$, then for each i, the neighborhood of v_i in the graph

$G - \{v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}\}$ is a clique. A graph is chordal if and only if it has a simplicial elimination order [9].

Lemma 6.11. *Let $<$ be a simplicial elimination ordering on an n-vertex graph G. If J is the orientation of G obtained by orienting each edge uv with $u < v$ from v to u, then G is d_J^+-saturable.*

Proof. We use induction on n. When $n = 1$, there is nothing to prove, so assume that $n > 1$ and the claim holds for smaller n. Let $<$ be a simplicial elimination order on G and let ℓ be a list assignment with $|\ell(v)| = d_J^+(v)$ for all v.

Let v be the minimum vertex in $<$, and let $w_1 < \ldots < w_t$ be the neighbors of v, written in order according to $<$. Because $N(v)$ is a clique, we have $d_J^+(w_i) \geq i$ for each $i \in [t]$, since w_i has, as smaller neighbors, at least v and $w_1, \ldots, w_{i-1}$. Thus, we may choose distinct colors $c_1, \ldots, c_t$ such that $c_i \in \ell(w_i)$ for each i.

Let $G' = G - v$ and let $J' = J - v$. Since the restriction of $<$ to G' is still a simplicial elimination order, and since J' is obtained from $<$ in the prescribed manner, the induction hypothesis says that G' is $d_{J'}^+$-saturable, where $d_{J'}^+(w)$ is the downdegree of w in J'. Furthermore, for all $w \in V(G')$, we have

$$d_{J'}^+(w) = \begin{cases} d_J^+(w) - 1, & \text{if } w \in N(v); \\ d_J^+(w), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let ℓ' be the list assignment on G' given by

$$\ell'(w) = \begin{cases} \ell(w) - c_i, & \text{if } w = w_i, \\ \ell(w), & \text{if } w \notin N(v). \end{cases}$$

Now $|\ell'(w)| = d_{J'}^+(w)$ for all $w \in V(G)$, so by the induction hypothesis, G' has a partial edge coloring ψ' that is ℓ'-down-saturating.

The partial coloring ψ' is almost ℓ-saturating in G, except that each vertex w_i may fail to have c_i on an incident edge. (As v has outdegree 0 in J, it makes no demands of the coloring.) We extend ψ' to a partial edge coloring of G by coloring each edge vw_i with color c_i if w_i does not yet have an incident edge of color c_i. Since the colors c_i are distinct, the resulting partial edge coloring ψ is still proper; thus, ψ is ℓ-saturating. Since ℓ was arbitrary, it follows that G is d_J^+-saturable. □

Theorem 6.3 follows immediately from Lemma 6.11 and Lemma 6.5: if D is a k-optimal set in a chordal graph G, then the induced subgraph $G[V(G) - D]$ is again chordal, so Lemma 6.11 implies that G satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 6.5.

References

1. Claude Berge, *Graphs*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 6, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1985, Second revised edition of part 1 of the 1973 English version. MR 809587 (87e:05050)
2. Guillaume Chapuy, Matt DeVos, Jessica McDonald, Bojan Mohar, and Diego Scheide, *Packing triangles in weighted graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **28** (2014), no. 1, 226–239. MR 3164555
3. Mustapha Chellali, Odile Favaron, Adriana Hansberg, and Lutz Volkmann, *k-domination and k-independence in graphs: a survey*, Graphs Combin. **28** (2012), no. 1, 1–55. MR 2863534 (2012k:05005)
4. Paul Erdős, Arthur L. Rubin, and Herbert Taylor, *Choosability in graphs*, Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, Calif., 1979) (Winnipeg, Man.), Congress. Numer., XXVI, Utilitas Math., 1980, pp. 125–157. MR 593902 (82f:05038)

5. Odile Favaron, *On a conjecture of Fink and Jacobson concerning k-domination and k-dependence*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **39** (1985), no. 1, 101–102. MR 805459 (86k:05064)
6. John Frederick Fink and Michael S. Jacobson, *n-domination in graphs*, Graph theory with applications to algorithms and computer science (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1984), Wiley-Intersci. Publ., Wiley, New York, 1985, pp. 283–300. MR 812671 (87e:05086)
7. ———, *On n-domination, n-dependence and forbidden subgraphs*, Graph theory with applications to algorithms and computer science (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1984), Wiley-Intersci. Publ., Wiley, New York, 1985, pp. 301–311. MR 812672 (87e:05087)
8. D. R. Fulkerson, *The maximum number of disjoint permutations contained in a matrix of zeros and ones*, Canad. J. Math. **16** (1964), 729–735. MR 0168583 (29 #5843)
9. D. R. Fulkerson and O. A. Gross, *Incidence matrices and interval graphs*, Pacific J. Math. **15** (1965), 835–855. MR 0186421 (32 #3881)
10. Fred Galvin, *The list chromatic index of a bipartite multigraph*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **63** (1995), no. 1, 153–158. MR 1309363 (95m:05101)
11. Philip Hall, *On representatives of subsets*, J. London Math. Soc **10** (1935), no. 1, 26–30.
12. P. E. Haxell, *Packing and covering triangles in graphs*, Discrete Math. **195** (1999), no. 1-3, 251–254. MR 1663859 (99h:05091)
13. P. E. Haxell and V. Rödl, *Integer and fractional packings in dense graphs*, Combinatorica **21** (2001), no. 1, 13–38. MR 1805712 (2002m:05157)
14. Penny Haxell, Alexandr Kostochka, and Stéphan Thomassé, *Packing and covering triangles in K_4-free planar graphs*, Graphs Combin. **28** (2012), no. 5, 653–662. MR 2964780
15. ———, *A stability theorem on fractional covering of triangles by edges*, European J. Combin. **33** (2012), no. 5, 799–806. MR 2889515
16. Michael Krivelevich, *On a conjecture of Tuza about packing and covering of triangles*, Discrete Math. **142** (1995), no. 1-3, 281–286. MR 1341453 (96c:05138)
17. Kenneth Lebensold, *Disjoint matchings of graphs*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B **22** (1977), no. 3, 207–210. MR 0450138 (56 #8435)
18. U. S. R. Murty, *An application of Rado's theorem to disjoint matchings in bipartite graphs*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **17** (1978), no. 2, 193–194. MR 491057 (80f:05054)
19. Oystein Ore, *Theory of graphs*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXXVIII, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1962. MR 0150753 (27 #740)
20. Gregory J. Puleo, *Tuza's conjecture for graphs with maximum average degree less than 7*, European Journal of Combinatorics **49** (2015), 134–152.
21. Aparna Lakshmanan S., Cs. Bujtás, and Zs. Tuza, *Small edge sets meeting all triangles of a graph*, Graphs Combin. **28** (2012), no. 3, 381–392. MR 2912661
22. ———, *Induced cycles in triangle graphs*, 2014.
23. Zsolt Tuza, *Finite and infinite sets. Vol. I, II*, Proceedings of the sixth Hungarian combinatorial colloquium held in Eger, July 6–11, 1981 (Amsterdam) (A. Hajnal, L. Lovász, and V. T. Sós, eds.), Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai, vol. 37, North-Holland Publishing Co., 1984, p. 888. MR 818224 (87a:05005)
24. ———, *A conjecture on triangles of graphs*, Graphs Combin. **6** (1990), no. 4, 373–380. MR 1092587 (92j:05108)
25. V. G. Vizing, *On an estimate of the chromatic class of a p-graph*, Diskret. Analiz No. **3** (1964), 25–30. MR 0180505 (31 #4740)
26. ———, *Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors*, Diskret. Analiz (1976), no. 29 Metody Diskret. Anal. v Teorii Kodov i Shem, 3–10, 101. MR 0498216 (58 #16371)